

Cultural Experts and Communicative Capitalism: Transformation of Communicative Practices

Dekalov, Vladislav; Kristina, Grigoryeva; Dina, Uskova

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Dekalov, V., Kristina, G., & Dina, U. (2017). Cultural Experts and Communicative Capitalism: Transformation of Communicative Practices. *Media Watch*, 8(3), 438-450. <https://doi.org/10.15655/mw/2017/v8i1/49155>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

Cultural Experts and Communicative Capitalism: Transformation of Communicative Practices

VLADISLAV DEKALOV, GRIGORYEVA KRISTINA & USKOVA DINA
Saint Petersburg State University, Russia

This paper, attempted to answer, how, in the age of totalizing mediated communication, the role of a cultural expert (i.e. a person with knowledge and competence for interpreting the cultural phenomena encountered by a non-reflexive person in everyday life) is transformed. Terms 'communicative capitalism' and 'digital labour' were used in this study. Through analyzing the communicative behavior of three Russian cultural experts (specializing in fashion, cinematography, and music) on their Instagram and Facebook pages authors identified typical linguistic and extra-linguistic practices of attracting and enclosing of Internet audience attention, multiplying of their communicative capital and monetizing it.

Keywords: communicative capitalism, digital labour, symbolic capital, postmodern culture, social networks

In the twentieth century, the cultural industry infected everything with sameness (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1997) and endowed the figure of the "expert" with a symbolic capital, applying which she or he was able to express legitimate judgments about the value of both elite and mass cultural products. Being an agent participating in the "production of the belief in the value of art in general and in the distinctive value of this or that work of art" (Bourdieu, 1995), the expert reinforced the existing symbolic hierarchies with her or his communicative practices. However, at the beginning of the 21st century homogenization and globalization of networked society make a communication spontaneous, unpredictable, impersonal. Networks become reflexive (i.e. generating a lot of different and equally legitimate opinions (Dean, 2010)). Their symbolic efficiency is declined (ibid). To describe the group dynamics of such networks, metaphors of "swarmed", "rhizomatic", "infuriated" are used (Galloway, 2014). Under the aegis of transnational platforms, the new informational reality elements are united into a kind of hypernetwork (Terranova, 2004), within which new relations of power and inequality arise.

"The postmodern condition" (Lyotard, 1998) changes the existing hierarchies and criteria of division into "high" and "low", "elite" and "mass". The global culture becomes "culturally diversified and ultimately contested by other cultural expressions" (Castells, 2009). In "the click bait age" situation (Ross, 2017), experts and critics are forced to betake a new forms of communicative behavior in order to get an attention of the online audience. One such form is blogging or keeping a branded page or community in a social network. In Russia, a number of cultural figures have personal pages on popular platforms such as Vkontakte, Facebook, Twitter, Telegram: these are experts in cinema, fashion, music,

Correspondence to: Vladislav Dekalov, Department of Public Relations in Business, School of Journalism and Mass Communications, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, VO, 1 Line, 26, 199004 Russia, E-mail: andavior@gmail.com

literature, theatrical art, as well as opinion leaders and professionals who constantly speak of culture and works of art. Each of these pages is characterized by content, the topics raised, the periodicity of publications and even a participation of an author itself (for example, some experts communicate with their followers through a moderator). But we can talk about a number of similar communicative practices, determined by the global network.

Critical analysis of these practices is necessary for understanding the transformation of an individual's everyday life in the information age when communication becomes digital, global and commodified. That is why studies in the framework of the "cultural and philosophical understanding" (Naumova, 2015) of capitalism are relevant. They include post-marxism and critical media researchers.

Theoretical Framework

The research is based on three concepts: communicative capitalism (Dean, 2010), digital labour (Fuchs, Sevignani, 2013), field and habitus (Bourdieu, 2007). All of them were revisited in the context of accumulating and monetizing an attention of Internet users (Dekalov, 2017).

J. Dean describes *communicative capitalism* as new circumstances of power and inequality within the digital platforms. Human "basic communicative activities" are mediated and enclosed 'as raw materials for capital accumulation' (Dean, 2016). In the new "ideological formation" contemporary communications media capture digital crowds in intensive and extensive networks of enjoyment, production, and surveillance (Dean, 2010). Dean's main idea is that in the networked society the content of a communicative act is less valuable than its "contribution" to the circulating informational flow.

C. Fuchs considers *digital labour* as an intersection of both information and physical labour (Fuchs, 2016). Internet platforms is based the exploitation of users' unpaid labour, who engage in the creation of content and the use of blogs, social networking sites, wikis, microblogs, content sharing sites for fun (Fuchs & Cevignani, 2013). The surplus value is extracted while selling a data commodity of these "active prosumers" (ibid) to advertisers.

According to Bourdieu, the three main species or forms of capital are economic, social and cultural (Bourdieu, 1986). Symbolic capital can be any of the capitals if it is "unrecognized as capital and recognized as legitimate competence, as authority exerting an effect of (mis) recognition" (ibid). The basic states of a capital: incorporated, objectified and institutionalized. The massification of electronic communications practices made the communicative field and communicative capital more meaningful (Candon, 2016).

Revisiting Dean's conception, we claim that an attention becomes the basic resource fueling new economic relations. Since each person's physical and mental resources are limited, there is a tough competition for her or his attention on the Internet. And asymmetry in its distribution too. Networks become fields where communicative capital embodies "power over the product in which the labour has been embodied" (Bourdieu, 2007). *Communicative capital* can be defined as an accumulation of users' attention on a particular segment of a network (Dekalov, 2017). It can potentially be converted into economic capital (i.e., can be monetized), and also into social and cultural ones.

We understand attention as an *informational labour-power*: in fact, Internet users are (often without even realizing it) virtual "workers" employed by a variety of "digital enterprises"—*network segments*. Some segments they only 'visit' passively consuming news feeds. At other, they explicitly work: creating, commenting or sharing posts, pictures, and multimedia content. Some kind of symbolic rewards (for example, likes), pleasure from communication, or feeling of self-realization serve as a 'salary'.

Segments are connected with each other technically (e.g. blogs inside the platform) and thematically (e.g. blogs of the same person at the different platforms). So, on the one hand, we can identify an individual with the social network, platform, or application he uses. On the other hand, each user is a “webholder” of a particular *network brand* (Gavra, 2016). Through its multiplication from the traditional media space, a network brand is created inside one or several platforms. In the networked environment, brands of popular communities, celebrities, public opinion leaders, and products of mass culture, coexist. Unlike memes, agenda events or narratives (in other words, “common places” (Virno, 2013)), a network brand is characterized by more explicit positioning and communicative strategy, clear ownership rights.

In both cases, double profit extraction takes place. Users’ data and digital tracks are absorbed with a constantly circulating flow of information (an exchange value, which is the greater, the more attention was drawn to a network segment and the more “digital labour” was spent to create an information product). At the same time, people consisted a network in some cases are ready to pay for the goods and services offered by segment/platform/network brand owners (here a use value comes to the fore).

Thus, an Internet user’s attention becomes an object of interest for the owners of social platforms and owners of network brands. In both cases, some practices of communicative capital multiplying are used. These practices consist of different ways of network participants attention attracting and enclosing.

This situation generates two groups of interrelated practices. The first is encouraging users to do informational work for symbolic rewards and selling the results of free labour in the form of data and digital analytics to advertisers. The second is selling certain products or services to users themselves. Both groups of practices increase the economic profit of the network segment owners.

There is *asymmetry in an attention distribution* in a network segment, where several network brands (users, groups of users, or organizations) concentrate most of the attention and the “long tail” of the remains participants involved in viewing and commenting. This “discursive elite” (Candon, 2016) has not only bigger communicative capital, but also great opportunities for applying to other species of capital. The existing economic, cultural and social inequalities persist in the network even with the remaining possibility of “hierarchy disruption” (ibid).

According to the Oxford dictionary definition, expert: is a person who is knowledgeable about or skillful in a particular area. A knowledge is the basis for an expert’s opinion on a particular cultural phenomenon. In a networked environment, especially when it comes to global communication platforms (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter), there is a latent audience demand for an expert opinion. At the same time, because of “rise of mass self-communication” (Castells, 2009), brand-new “practices of autonomy” (ibid) contradict with the prevailing models of media consumption. In other words, the user now is guided by a multitude of opinions, often ambiguous ones.

“The global entertainment industry, which supports and is itself supported by advertising, is the main channel for creating a consumerist, branded culture” (ibid). An expert who moves from traditional media to the network thereby transforms his personal brand and made it network one. Furthermore, in a networked environment, an expert could potentially be a representative of the so-called “discursive elite” on the network segment. On the one hand, she or he satisfies the request of an audience focused on the opinion (audience of the topic), on the other, forms an audience of her or his own. Both experts and their audiences become participants of new (digital) labour relations.

Communicative practices of an expert are determined by her or his symbolic position on a segment: she or he concentrates most of the attention of users, encloses this attention, and tries to monetize it. Also, she or he reinforces a symbolic power in the network section. The effectiveness of these practices depends on expert's communicative competence, i.e. the ability to use the basic technical means of the platform (the correct design of the post, the selection of text, the use of stickers or emojis etc.), as well as understanding the boundaries, norms of interaction and morals of the community (Efimov, 2015) when referring to a particular topic.

Discussing with J. Dean, we support the opinion of P. Candon on the need to study the linguistic component of communicative capital, since the medium in a networked environment is the language, and the expert realizes herself or himself as a linguistic personality (Karaulov, 2010). That is why when investigating communicative practices, the structural and quantitative dimensions of an expert's blog activity are important, as well as the qualitative analysis of her or his publications and the study of idiostyle (Grigoriev, 1983).

Hypothesis

A cultural expert, being involved in instant communication on social networks, becomes part of the system of new socio-economic relations based on a network audience attention.

The main questions of the research:

- RQ 1: Which practices are used by experts for attracting and enclosing users' attention?
- RQ 2: Which practices are applied by experts to multiply their communicative capital and to extract surplus value from their "webholders"?
- RQ 3: How do experts reinforce their symbolic status as a "discourse elite" at their network segment?

Data Collection and Analysis

For this research, we select three Russian experts. Encoding them, we use the following abbreviations: R (Artem Rondarev, an expert in music); D (Anton Dolin, an expert in cinematography); K (Evelina Khromchenko, an expert in fashion).

Basis for selection: a publication activity (at least on post a week), a large number of followers. At the same time, each expert's audience differed by an order of magnitude: R has about 7,000 followers, D has 40,000 followers, and K has more than 7,00,000 followers. As a basis for the analysis, we consider authors' posts in one of the social networks: Facebook for D and R, Instagram for K. The time for selection of the study is from March 2016 to March 2017. All data for the time was copied and saved in MS Excel documents.

Methodology

A methodology is based on economical and sociological interpretations of the term "capital": communicative capital supplements a Bourdieuzian "triple" of economic, social and cultural capitals.

Quantitative Analysis: For measurements of experts' communicative practices, we used structural-thematical analyses, analyses of technical means and analyses of publications effectiveness. The main characteristic: share of professional posts, a share of agenda

posts and share of promo-posts in a total number of posts. We claim these characteristics as the most relevant ones for demonstrating the situation of communicative capitalism double profit-extracting by an example of following practices: attracting and enclosing audience's attention, and reinforcing of an expert's symbolic status on a network segment. Then we measured share of agenda-posts in total number and in the most popular posts (top 10 per cent post sorted by gained comments). The same methodic we applied to expert's promo-posts.

Quality Characteristics: Due to the fact that a dialogue between an author and a reader often relies on associations, associative connections between text's key words play a significant role in forming a text's sense. They act as "contact points" between an author and a reader and help to regulate reader's activity according to author's communicative strategy. To point out the most significant lexical units in terms of artistry and pragmatism and their intra-textual liaisons, which were actualized by authors, we resorted to revealing of key words' associative and semantic fields (Bolotnova, 2009).

The topics and key concepts for K, D and R are, respectively, "fashion", "cinema" and "music", which are predetermined by their professional interests. That was the basis for picking out the group of texts dedicated to professional matters, in which semantic kernel, made up of nominations from key concepts' associative field: (i) creative products (a film/a clothing/a text, a song, an idea, an image); (ii) creators (directors/designers/musicians); (iii) a product's demonstration (an exposition/a video); (iv) an event (a festival/a fashion week); (v) an expert's work (a book/an interview), was revealed via content analysis software.

Further analysis was based on the contextual method, in which the greatest emphasis was put on modeling name's compatibility with its predicates, through which subject's perspective on the reality is reflected. On the grounds of analysis' results the main projective (and, broader, associative) senses, shared by key concepts and neighboring phenomena, which are included in concepts' associative field, and which direct lexical-semantic groups' ("fashion", "cinema" and "music") compatibility in texts.

Results I. Structural-Thematic Analysis

Attracting and enclosing an Internet users' attention

To answer the question "Which practices are used by experts for attracting and enclosing users' attention?" we have examined correspondences between common array of publications and: (i) posts about professional topic (from this point onward: R – music; D – cinema; K – fashion); (ii) posts dedicated to current news agenda and hotly debated topics.

Category	R	D	K
Social network	Facebook (more than 4 k. friends and more than 7 k. subscribers)	Facebook (5 k. friends, 46 k. subscribers)	Instagram (763 k. followers)
Publications in total	Over 600	Over 600	Over 700
Share of publications devoted to professional matters	22 per cent	50.6 per cent	69.6 per cent
Share of publications devoted to news agenda and debated topics	42 per cent	46.7 per cent	41 per cent
Are there overlaps among posts?	Yes (there are more current agenda's events than the ones on professional matters)	Yes (professional events prevail on other types)	Yes (professional events dominate)
Instances of publications' topics concerning professional matters	Awarding Nobel Prize for Literature to Bob Dylan, Releasing albums (Nick Cave, Splin); Viral clips (Robbie Williams, Leningrad)	Oscar awarding ceremony, film festivals (Cannes, Berlin, Venice), New films' releases	Fashion weeks, occasional shows, death of prominent fashion figures (Franca Sozzani, Sonia Rykiel, Jamie Galanosa), Met Gala 2016
Instances of publications dedicated to news agenda and debated topics	Possible abortion ban, Overton window, critique of political statements (Prilepin, Kusturiza)	Antisemitism, possible abortion ban, prominent figures' death (D. Bowie, U. Eco, L. Cohen)	MTV Awards, George Michael's death
Share of publications dedicated to news agenda and debated topics (top 10 per cent in terms of comments' number)	49.0 per cent	66 per cent	37 per cent
Involving in comment's process	Yes	Yes	Yes

High frequency of publications and experts' engaging in commentary section act to keep and even enclose their audience's attention.

All experts write extensively on their professional topics at their pages. D's and K's shares of posts on films and fashion are greater than 50 per cent. In R respective share is less due to greater attention to topics like literature, cinema, and culture as a whole. In addition, R's posts are more comprehensive and more likely to contain narrative component: several posts might be devoted to a same event or storyline.

More than one-third of every expert's publications is devoted to professional matters as well as news agenda and "hot topics". Experts are eager to resort to event's context, take direct or indirect part in the most circulated discussions on important topics. However, the proportion of posts on newsbreaks is less significant in K, which speaks for its expert's smaller dependence on news agenda. D and R, on the contrary, attract attention particularly by event-related publications. Moreover, their share in R outweighs the percentage of professional posts.

Also, it is worth to notice that it is true for all experts that some part of their publications is related not to their field of expertise or news agenda but personal or other matters.

Multiplying and monetizing a communicative capital

To answer the question "Which practices are applied by experts to multiply their communicative capital and to extract surplus value from their «webholders»?" let us look into experts' advertising publications, which are going to be represented by: (i) posts with links to expert's publications on specialized online media; (ii) posts advertising expert's real-world work: workshops, events, lectures, products. Let us point out another ways to stimulate digital labour as well.

Category	R	D	K
Share of advertising publications	5 per cent	32 per cent	23 per cent
The object of advertising	An own publication, a public lecture, radio broadcasting	A public lecture, a book, a film show, an own publication	A personal website, a lecture, an appearance on radio/TV, own collection
Technical tools used in ad publications	links with branded preview	links with branded preview, references	hashtags, references, links
Extra-linguistic means, used in ad publications	An image (a billposter)	An image (a photo, a billposter)	A video, an image (a photo of advertised object, a celebrity's photo)
Presence of posts stimulating a discussion	Yes (questions might be come upon as part of provoking a discussion on debated topics)	Yes (An expert asks for an advice; rhetorical questions might be come upon as part of provoking a discussion on debated topics)	Yes (both direct and rhetorical could be found)

A significant share of D's and K's publications (23 per cent and 32 per cent respectively) has advertising functionality. Experts actively use their social networks' pages for PR and promoting their own projects and products. In D these are publications, lectures, projects (his book about J. Jarmusch), organized shows and events (including Luc Dardenne's visit and his book's promoting with D's foreword). In K these are lectures and her own fashion lines. For both K's and D's posts publishing a certain frequency and periodicity might be pointed out (eg. for D—series of posts from The Cannes Film Festival supplied with hashtag #cannes, for K-publications devoted to Milan Fashion Week with hashtag #mfw and Paris Fashion Week with hashtag #pfw).

On the contrary, R has a little share of advertising posts, which are predominantly made up of publications, lectures, and events by Higher School of Economics. Unlike D and K, R uses his own platform as a platform for publishing, whereas the former two are more likely to give links on their appearances on TV, radio, printed and Internet media.

As far as encouraging users to do informational work is concerned, all three experts resort to direct questions to the audience, which are designed to bring about a conversation. In K they are largely concerning fashion and style; in D unrelated topics (for instance, personal questions about traveling, literature, and music) as well as "hot" ones (politics). R's situation is similar except for the questions within topics where cultural and general agenda overwhelm personal matters.

Reinforcement of symbolic status

To answer the question "How do experts reinforce their symbolic status as a "discourse elite" at their network segment?", let us examine a common structure of an expert's page. In order to do that, the markers of symbolic status, represented in experts' blogs, are going to be determined. Within communicative space experts' symbolic status is maintained by platform's technical features as well as by content of expert's publications.

Category	R	D	K
Is a connection to one or several major media outlets being emphasized?	No	Yes (Meduza, internet media; Mayak, radio station)	Yes (Modniy Prigovor, TV show)
Used technical tools	links to official events	Information on the page about media which D is involved in; links to official events	"Official account" status
Markers of social status and social connections	No	Yes (photos and interviews with directors and actors, reports from events)	Yes (photos with designers and couturiers)

Information from D's and K's pages reveals that an expert is affiliated with a major media outlet. This includes numerous links to their previous employers at D and official status of Instagram account at K (a blue check mark next to account's name), whereas R has no clues of that kind.

Furthermore, R's publications bear almost no mention of its link to other prominent figures of cultural field (few mentions of "Logos" magazine's editorial board). D and K, at their turn, often mention directors, actors, couturiers in their publications' texts and publish photos with them. Besides that, D also publishes photos and check-ins from high-

profile events in the cinema industry, for instance, from The Cannes Film Festival. It is safe to say that K's and D's symbolic statuses in cultural field are emphasized much stronger than R's, which realizes itself as an expert primarily in a communicative field.

Results II. Qualitative Analysis

Use of the linguistic means for attracting attention

The analysis made it possible to identify common features and differences in the use of linguistic means by experts. So, the adjectival component is quite extensive in posts K and D, in which the vocabulary with a neutral and positive appraisal is concentrated. On the contrary, R does not place the main emphasis on the adjectival component. In his posts, there are adjectives with different estimates, but it is rather difficult to single out the prevailing one.

The positive evaluation clearly dominates over the negative in fashion and movie critics' texts, which in the case of D is associated with elements of the semantic core like the movie ("the worst I've seen this year") and the director ("Palme de Merde personally introduced by me is awarded to Sean Penn"). K prefers to express a critical opinion on the creativity of designers only through the prism of personal taste: "not my favorite collection." As readers subtly notice in the comments: everything that Evelina does not like is not represented in her Instagram. At the level of nominal compatibility, clearly positive aspect is expressed in words: "miracle", "masterpiece", "rapture", "brilliance", "luck". In the texts of the fashion critic, a positive evaluation is often expressed with the help of a combination of adverb + verb: "beautifully demonstrates the dress", "boldly stylizes the dress", "the dress always surprises me." At the adjectival level, it is possible to note the typical compatibility of evaluative adjectives with nouns, and in fact a complete absence of epithets. In texts D, you can find adjectives in the superlative degree: "best", "best of the best".

This leads us to the additional hypothesis that the positive evaluation predominance in the texts D and K may indicate the "exclusivity" of the information they provide, which the authors are forced to pay attention to. Exclusiveness is also emphasized by such characteristics of "fashion" and "cinema" as novelty: ("new", "modern", "fresh" collection, "new", "fresh" interviews) and uniqueness: "unique", "first in the world", "Unique" show, festival, which the "mere mortal" cannot enter; in fashion this category is defined by the notion of "couture": "winter couture", "couture collection").

Unlike D and K, R is more critical in his statements, he does not strive for the intentional allocation of "exclusives". His speech is characterized by an ironic, sarcastic connotation: "I've remembered only that the song is written as an unchanging loop, in which some thin male voices are howling like puppies." Sometimes, for special expressiveness, obscene vocabulary, jargon and intentional spelling mistakes can be used, as a connection to Internet slang of certain online communities. A distinctive feature of this expert's posts is the abundance of terms that bring the language closer to the academic.

In the speech of all experts bright artistic and expressive means are encountered: amplification ("music will be bad, unfit, anemic, devoid of drive, although very skillfully made "for gourmets and thinking people", "the film is pompous, pretentious, dull and dead, just plain boring"), metaphors ("every movie is a mirror, but this one is the best of mirrors", "a portrait of a family in the era interior", "a collection—an ode to a simple rural life in the spirit of Marie Antoinette", Sonia Rykiel – "the Parisian knitwear queen"), but they are not typical.

In general, it could be said that binary oppositions are blurred in the texts of experts (good-bad). In D and K, it happens due to the fact that the main emphasis is on

"exclusivity", highlighting the best. Their speech is characterized by the use of quite typical combinations, which should be understandable to the widest possible layers of the audience. For R "exclusive" is not the object, but his opinion about the cultural phenomenon. His speech is more expressive, ironic, somewhat academic, aimed at a narrower audience. He deliberately departs from the emotional evaluation of the composer/performer/song/clip, rationalizing his opinion and constructing a critical, to some extent, a dialectical mini-narrative flavored with words (such as "implicit," "immanent," "pejorative"), which the audience identifies with the individual style of the expert.

Use of linguistic means for multiplying and monetizing a communicative capital

During the analysis, we have identified a group of ways to stimulate the audience to do informational work as well as real actions and purchases.

In the first case, we can talk about a deliberately provoking discussion, which is achieved through an appeal to the audience with the question: (K) "Which dress do you like more?", "Who wore the V-cut better?", And in some cases, variants of answers are offered, backed up by a visual series; (D) "And what really cool and breakthrough is now happening in modern jazz music (vocal, instrumental-it does not matter)?" R uses rhetorical questions ("First, what kind of slow finals do Beethoven have?") or ironically plays on the questions of his audience ("Well, here on all sides: Why not Cohen, but Dylan?").

Another mean (strongly marked in D and K) is avarice in artistic expressive means (often used to give an informational tone to the text), which contributes to the appearance of comments, in which readers ask the expert to express their opinion. This stimulation is supported by the use of verbs with an incentive modality, interrogative and exclamatory sentences: "I recommend!", "Oh God, what's happening!", "A film about VINYL! Comeon!", "Read!".

Stimulation for purchases is due to the appeal to the categories of uniqueness, novelty, sensationalism, success: "exclusive reportage", "news", "new video", "dress codes for success", "for the first time, incidentally, for all the time I read about a Russian rock in ZIL, on the eve of the lecture there are tickets". Also in the texts of K, there is an appeal to the example of celebrities (stylists, designers, fashion journalists) who have already purchased things created by the fashion expert. Posts with this orientation have a general introductory design: "but at this time." Sometimes there is an appeal to your own example—if you liked the image, K tells you where to buy it; D goes to the screening of the film and advises everyone; R oversees the Internet project, materials on which it is worth reading.

Stimulation to purchases happens due to the appeal to the categories of uniqueness, novelty, sensationalism, success: "exclusive reportage", "news", "new video", "dress codes for success", "for the first time for all the time I read my lecture about Russian rock In ZIL, tickets are available now." Also in the texts of K there is an appeal to the example of celebrities (stylists, designers, fashion journalists) who have already purchased things created by the fashion expert. Posts with this orientation have a common introductory design, "and at this time." Sometimes there is an appeal to his own example—if you liked the image, K tells you where to buy it; D watches the film and advises it to everyone; R oversees the Internet project, which articles are worth reading.

Advertising posts from K and D are distinguished by an incentive: "Put on your little black dress and visit my master class", "Read it, and go to the cinema on Thursday". In the texts of R, there is a comic and ironic connotation: "You can listen to how I played in Yekaterinburg with my best performance, "Theodore, you're wrong", of course (referring to Theodore Adorno)". The intention of advertising posts R is more neutral ("you can listen", "you can find out").

In all advertising posts (as opposed to professional posts), the consumer is fairly clearly outlined: "If anyone wants to know about the urban life of jazz, and listen to some good jazz on the autumn evening, then here you can go for all of this." This is also facilitated by the use of rhetorical questions: "Did not have time to buy gifts?", "Do you want to understand the peculiarities of the current trend of the 1990s?"

There is also a reward system: there are symbolic ("You will get samples of the correct pronunciation of the names of favorite brands," "join us, it will be fun") and real rewards ("all my subscribers will get 5 per cent discount to any of handbags and shoes in the collection", " And books will be sold at a publishing price").

Reinforcement of the symbolic status: place and role of the expert

In the course of identifying the semantic core and associative fields of concepts, it became clear that the amount of use of the word "fashionista", "listener", "cinema-goer", which together would describe consumer of fashion products, music, and cinema, is not enough to describe the concepts of dominant. This indicates that "consumer" is meant simply as a part of the existing hierarchy, but it is not the main part.

The passivity of the consumer is also reflected in the verbal combination of nominations, where he does not act as the subject of the action, the action is usually directed at him. This is facilitated by the use of an incentive modality: "come," "do not miss this film," "sign up for bananas at the turn of the 1980s and '90s."

For the expert, presentation process becomes more meaningful, not the perception of the audience. That is why concepts "fashion" and "cinema" in the semantic core have a nomination-"show" as a demonstration of the product. For the concept of "music", designed in R posts, a "clip" is becoming a nomination, which is considered not only as a product of a creative activity but also as a presentation of music, songs, musicians. Consequently, a typical situation is when an expert is the only one who has the right to interpret what he has seen. Often experts back this up by appealing to their experience and status, which is most clearly expressed in terms of the use of personal pronouns that contribute to the expression of "subjective reliability" (Shcheglova, 2013): "I prefer the wedding proposal @maisonfrancescoscognamiglio"; "Woody Allen and Romanian cinema. Tastes differ (I would prefer the second)", "and in general, I am not a supporter of Adorno".

The reinforcement of the status also takes part in the formation of ideas about the hierarchy of fashion, music, and cinema, which makes it possible to characterize them as systems within which an order is formed, with a certain role of the expert. The stability of these systems is emphasized by the use of extremely typical collocations in adjectival and nominal compatibility. For example, common to all experts is the use of collocations that characterize the geographical ("Parisian fashion", "Chinese film", "Russian music"), chronological order ("previous film", "last collection", "former test"), as well as stating a place in the established cultural hierarchy ("art house cinema"/"mainstream cinema", "prêt-à-porter"/"Haute couture", genre peculiarity of music: "country music", "folk music"). At the level of nominal combinations, the following bundles are typical: film+director, collection+designer, performer/group+song. This allows not only to emphasize the author's origin of the mass culture products but also contributes to the reinforcement of the hierarchical nature of the phenomena under consideration.

The projective meanings that are generated in the texts largely explain the position of the expert in relation to her or his audience, her or his tasks and the definition of the role. In the body of texts on the professional subjects of K, a key projective meaning was revealed—"fashion as an art, show" (showing as "show", "attraction", "representation", "art-action", designers as "fashion artists", collection as "Art event"); Other projective meanings are not the priority: "fashion as business" ("fashion retail", "fashion-biz", "fashion

shop"); "Fashion as an area of professional activity" ("fashion editors", "fashion career", "fashion-purpose"), etc. The category of art becomes an important projective meaning for D: "cinema as art" (film-"masterpiece"; "classics", director-"genius", "artist", "art director", "director's picture", showing as a "holiday", "event"). To a lesser extent, "cinema as a process" ("premiere", "rolling", "success" of the film, which is "taken to the festival" and "rewarded", is "evaluated" by the jury). For R, the idea of music as "science" is a priority (this is emphasized by the frequency of use of terminological vocabulary: "music structure", "musical pattern", "music track", "musical intonation"). Appeal to art and science gives experts the right to emphasize their importance because only they can correctly assess the "work of art" or understand the true meaning of the song lyrics. This helps to elevate the object of discussion over everyday life.

This, in turn, generates the specific attitude of experts to criticism: "I am immediately reporting: on this profile are blocked all who express negative #valuablepresonalopinion about the models"; "Objections (in comments to this post, in other places - for God's sake) are not accepted, do not even hope", "so, where did I get another anti-humanitarian?". D and R react quite strongly to offensive comments, first warning about the "ban", and then fulfilling their promises. Account K is moderated.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that in D and R accounts are often posts with reflections on the place and role of the cultural expert in the modern world (about linguistic means in traditional music criticism, about the difficulties in describing the film, reviews, about the readers of musical critics "in glossy magazines like Rolling Stone"). One of the reasons for this is a huge number of alternative (often aggressively imposed) opinions about different cultural products. The right of nomination and the symbolic capital of the expert are under threat.

Conclusion

Cultural experts become independent actors on the Internet and take part in attention distribution processes, which determine communicative practices applied. An expert functions now is not only in nominating (as it was before the Internet), but also in attracting users' to her or his network brand, enclosing their attention, monetizing it, as well reinforcing a symbolic status on both cultural and communicative fields of a network segment. To achieve these goals an expert uses practices consisted of technical tools of platforms and linguistic means. These practices maintain asymmetry in an attention distribution, as well as, metaphorically saying, "exploitation" of a digital labour. But it worth noting, that the most of the profit made is appropriated by platform owners. An expert is only an agent of transformed capitalism formation. She or he is "active prosumer" too. The more she or he does informational work and involves in mediated communication with an audience, the more is a threat to her or his status as the professional in a cultural field.

References

- Bolotnova, N. (2009) *Philological Analysis of Text*. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Sociologie de l'espace social*. Saint-Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood.
- Candon, P. (2016). *Online Public Sphere or Communicative Capital? Blogs and News Sites in Ireland 2010 – 13* (Ph. D. Thesis). Dublin: Trinity College, The University of Dublin.
- Castells, M. (2009) *Communication Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dean, J. (2010). *Blog Theory. Feedback and Capture in the Circuits of Drive*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Dean, J. (2016). *Crowds and Party*. London and Brooklyn: Verso.
- Dekalov, V. (2017). *Communicative Capitalism: a Thesaurus, and Prospects of Concept Development*. Russian School of Public Relations, 9, pp. 52-70.
- Efimov, E. (2015). *Social Internet-networks (methodology and research practice)*. Volgograd: Volgograd Scientific Press.
- Fuchs, C. (2016). *Critical Theory of Communication*. New Readings of Lukács, Adorno, Marcuse, Honneth and Habermas in the Age of the Internet. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Fuchs, C. and Sevignani, S. (2013). What is Digital Labour? What is Digital Work? What's their Difference? And why do these Questions Matter for Understanding Social Media? *tripleC*, 11 (2), 237-293.
- Galloway, A., Thacker, E., and Wark, M. (2014). *Excommunication. Three Inquires In Media And Mediation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gavra, D. (2016) *Informational Logistics in the Communications of the Region. Òhe Territory Of New Opportunities*. The Herald of Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, 1, pp. 113-118.
- Grigoryev, V. (1983) *Grammar of idiostyle*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. (1997). *Dialektik der Aufklaerung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Moscow and Saint-Petersburg: Medium.
- Karaulov, Yu. (2010) *Russian language and language personality*. Moscow: Publishing house LCI.
- Lyotard, J-F. (1998). *La Condition Postmoderne*. Saint-Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Naumova, E. (2015) *Capitalism and Culture: Philosophical Review*. Saint-Petersburg: Conflictology Development Foundation.
- Shcheglova, E. (2013) Specific uses of phytonyms in I. Goncharov's Frigate "Pallada" voyage sketches. *Acta linguistic Petropolitana*, 9 (2), pp. 592-293.
- Ross, A. (2017). The Fate of the Critic in the Clickbait Age. <http://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/the-fate-of-the-critic-in-the-clickbait-age> (accessed 17 Apr 2017)
- Terranova, T. (2004). *Network Culture. Politics for the Informational Age*. London: Pluto Press.
- Virno, P. (2013) *Grammatica della moltitudine Per un'analisi delle forme di vita contemporanee*. Moscow: Ad Marginem Press.

Vladislav Dekalov is a postgraduate student in the Department of PR in Business, School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. His research focuses on processes of a society digital transformation and new communicative practices appear as a result.

Grigoryeva Kristina is a postgraduate student in the Department of TV and Radio Journalism at School of Journalism and Mass Communication, Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. Her research focuses on the representation of the concept "fashion" in modern media.

Uskova Dina is a postgraduate student in the Department of Journalism Theory at School Journalism and Mass Communication, Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. She analyzes musical criticism in her scientific works.